

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

D STATES DEPARTMENT

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.nspto.gov

Γ	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
	09/424,500	02/22/2000	AKIRA SATO	104788	8062	
	25944 7	7590 03/11/2003				
	OLIFF & BE	RRIDGE, PLC		EXAM	EXAMINER LEE, GRANVILL D	
	P.O. BOX 199 ALEXANDRI			LEE, GRA		
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				2825		
				DATE MAILED: 03/11/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			<i>Y</i>	
	Application No.	icant(s)		
. Advisory Action	09/424,500	SATO, AKIRA		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Granvill D. Lee	2825		
The MAILING DATE of this communication	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address		
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS Therefore, further action by the applicant is required final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be eith condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of A Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.11	er: (1) a timely filed amendn Appeal (with appeal fee); or (	is application. A proper reply to nent which places the application	n in	
PERIOD FOI	R REPLY [check either a) or	b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of the event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY 706.07(f).	is Advisory Action, or (2) the date set ater than SIX MONTHS from the mail	ing date of the final rejection.		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shough above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	extension and the corresponding am- rtened statutory period for reply origin	ount of the fee. The appropriate extensionally set in the final Office action; or (2) as	n fee under s set forth in	
<ol> <li>A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appearance</li> <li>CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (3)</li> </ol>				
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be enter	red because:			
(a) \( \square\) they raise new issues that would require	further consideration and/or	search (see NOTE below);		
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);				
<ul><li>(c) they are not deemed to place the applica issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	tion in better form for appea	by materially reducing or simp	lifying the	
(d) they present additional claims without ca	anceling a corresponding nur	nber of finally rejected claims.		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following	rejection(s):			
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) w canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	vould be allowable if submitte	ed in a separate, timely filed am	nendment	
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ reque application in condition for allowance becaus		en considered but does NOT p	lace the	
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considere raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	d because it is not directed S	SOLELY to issues which were n	ewly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amend explanation of how the new or amended clair			an	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as foll	ows:			
Claim(s) allowed:				
Claim(s) objected to: 11 and 24.				
Claim(s) rejected: 1-10 and 12-23 and 25-30.				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:				
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on	is a)□ approved or b)□	disapproved by the Examiner	r.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stat	tement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)		
10. Other:	•	Mus She		
		MATTHEW SMITH	Б	
		SUPERVIOURY PATENT EXAMINE TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800	<b>н</b> _	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant has forwarded two assertions in his response—that the support member is not a lead frame and that there is no pressure or stress provided by the pins of the prior art Japanese references. Firstly, the examiner reads the element 2 as reading on a lead frame as it is connected to the leads and supports the chip. As to the second issue, the pin support structure does indeed provide some stress or pressure on the lead frame as it is designed to retain the lead frame 2 in a set horizontal position(See Figures 4 and 5 of JP'282). Therefore, for these reasons the examiner finds applicant's arguments unpersuasive..